

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF VERMONT

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA :  
 :  
 v. : File No. 1:09-CR-64-02  
 :  
 JEREMY D. ZULLO :  
 :  
 \_\_\_\_\_ :

RULING ON MOTION FOR PRODUCTION OF GRAND JURY TRANSCRIPTS  
(Doc. 1213)

Defendant Jeremy Zullo filed a pro se motion<sup>1</sup> for production of grand jury transcripts under Fed. R. Crim. P. 6(e)(3)(E)(ii). The government opposes the motion. (Doc. 1215.) Zullo has not filed a reply. Zullo has an appeal pending and a similar motion was denied at the appellate court which held the motion must be made in this Court. United States v. Zullo, No. 13-3152 (Doc. 48).

In order to obtain copies of grand jury transcripts, Defendant must show the material sought is needed to avoid a possible injustice in another judicial proceeding, a particularized need for such disclosure that outweighs the need for secrecy, and the request is structured to cover only needed material. See Douglas Oil Co. of Cal. v. Petrol Stops Nw., 441 U.S. 211, 219 (1979); see also United States v. Sells Eng'g, Inc., 463 U.S. 418, 443 (1983) (citing Douglas and noting a defendant must make “a strong showing of particularized need”).

Defendant has not shown sufficient particularized need for the entirety of the grand jury transcripts. Defendant’s motion for production of grand jury transcripts is, therefore, DENIED.

SO ORDERED.

Dated at Brattleboro, in the District of Vermont, this 5<sup>th</sup> day of May, 2014.

/s/ J. Garvan Murtha  
Honorable J. Garvan Murtha  
United States District Judge

---

<sup>1</sup> As the Court has noted, because Zullo is a pro se litigant, the Court will read his papers “liberally and interpret them to raise the strongest arguments that they suggest.” McPherson v. Coombe, 174 F.3d 276, 280 (2d Cir. 1999) (internal quotation marks and citation omitted).